



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

August 2004



Draft Environmental Impact Statement

West Side Reservoir Post-Fire Project

Flathead National Forest
Hungry Horse and Spotted Bear Ranger Districts
Flathead County, Montana



NOTES TO REVIEWERS:

Reviewers should provide the Forest Service with their comments during the review period of the draft environmental impact statement. This will enable the Forest Service to analyze and respond to the comments at one time and to use information acquired in the preparation of the final environmental impact statement, thus avoiding undue delay in the decision making process. Reviewers have an obligation to structure their participation in the National Environmental Policy Act process so that it is meaningful and alerts the agency to the reviewers' position and contentions. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC*, 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978). Environmental objections that could have been raised at the draft stage may be waived if not raised until after completion of the final environmental impact statement. *City of Angoon v. Hodel* (9th Circuit, 1986) and *Wisconsin Heritages, Inc. v. Harris*, 490 F. Supp. 1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980). Comments on the draft environmental impact statement should be specific and should address the adequacy of the statement and the merits of the alternatives discussed (40 CFR 1503.3).

The Forest Service strives to use the most current and pertinent science available. **Please help us by including a complete bibliography if you choose to cite published research when responding to our requests for comments.**

DISCLAIMERS:

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, or marital or family status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 14th and Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call (202) 720-5964 (voice and TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Data Accuracy - The Forest Service uses the most current and complete data available. GIS data and product accuracy may vary. They may be developed from sources of differing accuracy, accurate only at certain scales, based on modeling or interpretation, incomplete while being created or revised, etc. Using GIS products for purposes other than those for which they were created may yield inaccurate or misleading results. The Forest Service reserves the right to correct, update, modify, or replace GIS products without notification. For more information, contact:

Flathead National Forest
1935 3rd Ave. East
Kalispell, MT 59901
(406) 758-5200

If a map contains contours, these contours were generated and filtered using the Digital Elevation Model (DEM) files. Any contours generated from DEM's using a scale of less than 1:100,000 will lead to less reliable results and should be used for display purposes only.

West Side Reservoir Post-Fire Project

Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Flathead National Forest Hungry Horse and Spotted Bear Ranger Districts Flathead County, Montana

Lead Agency:	USDA Forest Service
Responsible Official:	Cathy Barbouletos , Forest Supervisor Flathead National Forest 1935 3 rd Ave. East, Kalispell, MT 59901
For Information and to Send Comments, Contact:	Bryan Donner , Planning Team Leader Tally Lake Ranger District 1335 Hwy 93 West, Whitefish, MT 59937 (406) 863-5408 comments-northern-flathead-tally-lake@fs.fed.us

Abstract: This draft environmental impact statement summarizes the analysis performed and resulting effects of the proposed implementation of timber salvage and access management treatments in the West Side Reservoir analysis area. A planning team identified the need to recover merchantable wood fiber affected by fires in a timely manner to support local communities and contribute to the long term yield of forest products. A proposed action to meet this need was developed. Issues that influenced the development of alternatives to the proposed action were retention of snags, old growth habitat, amount of salvage proposed, bark beetle management, grizzly bear and other wildlife security, water quality, and road access. In addition to a no action alternative (alternative A) and the proposed action (alternative B), three action alternatives that respond to the stated needs but emphasize specific issues were developed. Alternative C emphasizes wildlife security, old growth, and water quality issues; alternative D emphasizes salvage and grizzly bear security issues, and alternative E emphasizes salvage and motorized access issues.

Date Comments Must Be Received: **October 6, 2004**

This page left blank intentionally.

Table of Contents

SUMMARY

CHAPTER 1 - PROPOSED ACTION

	<i>Page</i>
I. DOCUMENT STRUCTURE AND BACKGROUND	1-1
II. PURPOSE AND NEED	1-3
III. PROPOSED ACTION	1-5
IV. DECISION FRAMEWORK	1-30
V. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT	1-30
VI. ISSUES	1-32
VII. SCOPE OF THE ANALYSIS	1-37

CHAPTER 2 - ALTERNATIVES

I. INTRODUCTION	2-1
II. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN DETAIL	
Features Common to All Action Alternatives	2-1
Monitoring	2-9
Alternative Summary and Descriptions	2-10
Alternative A (No Action)	2-10
Alternative B (Proposed Action)	2-10
Alternative C	2-11
Alternative D	2-29
Alternative E	2-47
III. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED STUDY	2-58
IV. COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES	2-61

CHAPTER 3 - AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT and ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

	<i>Page</i>
INTRODUCTION	3-1
 DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT BY RESOURCE AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE ALTERNATIVES	
Vegetation	3-3
Spruce and Douglas-fir Bark Beetles	3-41
Invasive Plant Species – Noxious Weeds	3-71
Threatened and Sensitive Plants	3-83
Fire and Fuels	3-103
Air Quality and Smoke Management	3-121
Hydrology	3-129
Fisheries	3-187
Soils	3-221
Introduction to Wildlife	3-245
Snags and Downed Woody Material Wildlife Habitat	3-249
Old Growth Habitat and Old Growth Associated Wildlife Species	3-267
Threatened Wildlife Species	3-285
Sensitive Wildlife Species	3-333
Neotropical Migratory Birds	3-371
Management Indicator Species – Commonly Hunted Big Game	3-377
Recreation	3-391
Visuals / Scenery	3-421
Heritage Resources	3-429
Socio-Economics	3-435

CHAPTER 4 - CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS	4-1
DISTRIBUTION OF THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT..	4-2

APPENDICES

Appendix A Glossary	A-1
Appendix B Forest Plan Management Area Descriptions, Goals, and Standards	B-1
Appendix C Best Management Practices	C-1
Appendix D Water Regulations	D-1
Appendix E Tree Mortality Guidelines	E-1
Appendix F Project Monitoring Plan	F-1
Appendix G Interdisciplinary Team’s Response to the 1995 Beschta Report.....	G-1

LITERATURE CITED

LIST OF FIGURES

<i>Figure</i>		<i>Page</i>
1-1	Vicinity Map	1-4
1-2	Alternative B – Proposed Salvage Treatments – Beta	1-11
1-3	Alternative B – Proposed Salvage Treatments – Doe	1-13
1-4	Alternative B – Proposed Salvage Treatments – Blackfoot	1-15
1-5	Alternative B – Proposed Salvage Treatments – Ball	1-17
1-6	Alternative B – Transportation Plan Map - North	1-21
1-7	Alternative B – Transportation Plan Map - South	1-23
1-8	Alternative A – Existing Transportation Map - North	1-25
1-9	Alternative A – Existing Transportation Map - South	1-27
2-1	Alternative C – Proposed Salvage Treatments – Beta	2-15
2-2	Alternative C – Proposed Salvage Treatments – Doe	2-17
2-3	Alternative C – Proposed Salvage Treatments – Blackfoot	2-19
2-4	Alternative C – Proposed Salvage Treatments – Ball	2-21
2-5	Alternative C – Transportation Plan Map - North	2-25
2-6	Alternative C – Transportation Plan Map - South	2-27
2-7	Alternative D – Proposed Salvage Treatments – Beta	2-35
2-8	Alternative D – Proposed Salvage Treatments – Doe	2-37
2-9	Alternative D – Proposed Salvage Treatments – Blackfoot	2-39
2-10	Alternative D – Proposed Salvage Treatments – Ball	2-41
2-11	Alternative D – Transportation Plan Map - North	2-43
2-12	Alternative D – Transportation Plan Map - South	2-45
2-13	Alternative E – Transportation Plan Map - North	2-53
2-14	Alternative E – Transportation Plan Map - South	2-55
3-1	Beta-Doris Fire Fire Severities	3-8
3-2	Doe Fire Fire Severities	3-9
3-3	Blackfoot Fire Fire Severities	3-10
3-4	Ball Fire Fire Severities	3-11
3-5	Pre-fire Structure	3-13
3-6	Post-fire Structure	3-13
3-7	Post-fire Forest Structure in Beta-Doris Area	3-14
3-8	Post-fire Forest Structure in Doe Fire Area	3-15
3-9	Post-fire Forest Structure in Blackfoot Fire Area	3-16
3-10	Post-fire Forest Structure in Ball Fire Area	3-17
3-11	Spruce Beetle Hazard	3-48
3-12	Douglas-fir Beetle Hazard	3-53
3-13	Fire History Map	3-106
3-14	Beta-Doris Fire Analysis Watersheds	3-131
3-15	Doe-Blackfoot Fires Analysis Watersheds	3-132
3-16	Ball Fire Analysis Watersheds	3-133
3-17	Cumulative Effects Analysis Area	3-171
3-18	Hungry Horse Dam and Reservoir	3-187
3-19	Status of Old Growth Habitat in the Beta and Doe Fire Areas	3-275
3-20	Status of Old Growth Habitat in the Blackfoot Fire Area	3-276
3-21	Status of Old Growth Habitat in the Ball Fire Area	3-277
3-22	Grizzly Bear Management Areas	3-287
3-23	Grey Wolf Habitat Analysis Area	3-311
3-24	Bald Eagle Nesting Territory Habitat	3-318
3-25	Canada Lynx Potential Habitat Components (North Half)	3-325
3-26	Canada Lynx Potential Habitat Components (South Half)	3-326
3-27	View of Hungry Horse Dam from Road 895H	3-424
3-28	Great Northern Mountain	3-425

This page left blank intentionally.